

Christopher R. Pitoun (SBN 290235)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
301 N. Lake Avenue, Suite 920
Pasadena, California 91101
Telephone: (213) 330-7150
Facsimile: (213) 330-7152
Email: christopherp@hbsslaw.com

Robert B. Carey (*pro hac vice*)
Leonard W. Aragon (*pro hac vice*)
Michella A. Kras (*pro hac vice*)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
11 West Jefferson, Suite 1000
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Telephone: (602) 840-5900
Facsimile: (602) 840-3012
Email: rob@hbsslaw.com
leonarda@hbsslaw.com
michellak@hbsslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

N.Z., R.M., B.L., S.M., and A.L.,
individually and on behalf of themselves
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FENIX INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,
FENIX INTERNET LLC, BOSS
BADDIES LLC, MOXY
MANAGEMENT, UNRULY AGENCY
LLC (also d/b/a DYSRPT AGENCY),
BEHAVE AGENCY LLC, A.S.H.
AGENCY, CONTENT X, INC., VERGE
AGENCY, INC., AND ELITE
CREATORS LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:24-cv-01655-FWS-SSC

**DECLARATION OF ROBERT B.
CAREY IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' EX PARTE
APPLICATION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO
RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS
FENIX INTERNATIONAL
LIMITED'S AND FENIX
INTERNET LLC'S MOTION TO
DISMISS FOR *FORUM NON
CONVENIENS* AND FOR LEAVE
TO SERVE LIMITED
DISCOVERY IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONSE**

Hon. Fred W. Slaughter

1 I, Robert B. Carey, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all of the courts of the
3 State of Arizona, and I have been admitted pro hac vice in this Court. I am a partner
4 at Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP, and have appeared in this case as one of the
5 counsel of record for Plaintiffs in the above-entitled action. I have personal
6 knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could and would
7 competently testify thereto.

8 2. I submit this declaration on behalf of Plaintiffs in support of Plaintiffs'
9 (1) Ex Parte Application to Vacate Current Briefing Schedule on Fenix Defendants'
10 Motion to Dismiss for Forum Non Conveniens ("FNC Motion"); (2) Motion for
11 Leave to Serve Limited Discovery in Support of Response to FNC Motion
12 ("Discovery Motion"); and (3) Request to Expedite Briefing on Plaintiffs'
13 Discovery Motion.

14 3. On November 7, 2024, I sent an email to Defense Counsel seeking to
15 meet and confer about "adjusting the schedule on your motion to accommodate
16 some jurisdictional discovery."

17 4. On November 8, 2024, Defense Counsel responded that his first
18 available time to discuss would be November 14, 2024, and asked what discovery
19 was contemplated "given that our 12(b)(2) motion was withdrawn pending a ruling
20 on the FNC Motion."

21 5. I met and conferred with Defense Counsel via videoconference on
22 November 14, 2024, during which time Defense Counsel again expressed
23 skepticism that any discovery was necessary in order to resolve the FNC Motion. I
24 pointed out that the Fenix Defendants had voluntarily agreed to jurisdictional
25 discovery in a related case in Illinois federal court ("*McFadden*"), and that it might
26 be less burdensome and/or more efficient for Fenix Defendants to agree to allow
27 Plaintiffs to use information produced in that case (to the extent relevant) in support
28 of their response to the FNC Motion here. Defense counsel did not reject the idea,

1 but asked for additional details about the nature of the discovery sought by
2 Plaintiffs.

3 6. The following day, I sent an email detailing the topics on which
4 Plaintiffs intended to seek limited discovery, as well as their relevance specifically
5 to the resolution of the FNC Motion. For the Court's convenience, the entirety of
6 that email is reproduced verbatim below:

7
8 From: Robert Carey <rob@hbsslaw.com>
9 Date: Friday, November 15, 2024 at 2:31 PM
10 To: Jason D. Russell - Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
11 LLP (jason.russell@skadden.com)
12 <jason.russell@skadden.com>
13 Subject: Fenix CD Cal

14 Jason,

15 Thanks for the call yesterday. As we discussed, Plaintiffs intend
16 to seek limited discovery on topics specifically related to the
17 Fenix Defendants' motion to dismiss on forum non conveniens
18 grounds (MTD). The topics are outlined below, and as we
19 mentioned, many of them result from the Declarations filed in
20 support of the MTD. The declarations purport to establish facts
21 supporting dismissal but contain significant ambiguities with
22 respect to key facts—some (although not all) of which are
23 explained below.

24 **FNC Discovery Topics:**

25 1. Specific details relating to Fenix Defendants' interactions
26 with / presence in California, which relate to the enforceability
27 of the forum selection clause (FSC), as well as the private and
28 public interest factors the court will need to consider
(specifically California's interest in and/or connection to the
underlying facts.. These include:

1.a. The number and identities of Fenix-related officers,
employees, non-creator independent contractors, and vendors in
California—specifically over the course of the relevant time
period (the Taylor Decl. talks about the lack of such affiliations
only in the present tense, e.g., ¶ 9).

1.b. Locations other than the UK where employees, officers,
and records are located (the Taylor Decl. only refers to being
located “primarily” in the UK (¶ 8).

1 1.c. The specific role(s) of Fenix Internet (a non-UK entity) in
2 OnlyFans' US- and/or California-based activities.

3 2. Details re: the "inconvenience" and cost-management issues
4 Fenix Defendants would suffer if the FSC was not enforced.
5 Among other things, locations of employees and officers are
6 also relevant to this topic, since Taylor only generally refers to
7 "the inconvenience to OnlyFans' personnel of litigating claims
8 all over the world."

9 3. Confirmation that all versions of the FSC were materially
10 identical during the relevant time period—especially in light of
11 the Taylor declaration's ambiguous testimony that "all
12 versions" from 2018 to the present were "substantially similar"
13 both in language and relevant formatting (both of which are
14 relevant to the FSC's enforceability).

15 **4. Fenix Defendants' Relationships with any other**
16 **California-based entities, including:**

17 **4.a. Agency Defendants**—many of whose headquarters are in
18 California. The declarations don't address these relationships—
19 even though they are at the heart of Plaintiff's Complaint, and
20 that they are clearly relevant to California's connection to /
21 interest in resolving the claims here.

22 **4.b. Counsel.** For example, Plaintiffs are aware that Fenix
23 Defendants have relationships with counsel in California related
24 to intellectual property disputes, but the declarations do not
25 establish that those relationships (or others that might exist) are
26 irrelevant to the FNC analysis.

27 **4.c. Vendors.** For example, although Plaintiffs are aware that
28 Fenix Defendants have a US subsidiary that contracts with
vendors who deal with OnlyFans merchandise sales; to the
extent those or other vendors used by Defendants are located in
and/or do business with California, this again relates to multiple
aspects of the FNC analysis having to do with the California
interests / public policies relevant to the FNC analysis.

As you pointed out, discovery on *purely* jurisdictional matters
is less relevant in light of the fact that the court is only deciding
the FNC motion; that said, to the extent jurisdictional discovery
overlaps with FNC-related discovery, that overlap doesn't make
the discovery irrelevant to the FNC analysis, and Plaintiffs are
entitled to discover information that resolves the ambiguities in
Defendants' declarations. Moreover, we have some additional
information relating to Fenix's California connections that we
wish validate.

Proposed Schedule:

Because discovery on these topics will likely entail document requests, interrogatories, and deposition testimony—and the timing, which will require working around holiday schedules—Plaintiffs also propose the following modifications to the briefing schedule recently approved by the court:

Hearing on FNC Motion and Motion re: use of pseudonyms (Initial Motions): From 1/30/25 to 4/3/25.

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Initial Motions: From 11/22/24 to 1/30/25.

Fenix Defendants' Replies: From 12/20/24 to 2/27/25.

Let me know how this works on our end. Last, can you let me know if your client is interested in permitting the McFadden discovery to be released to us in this case to see if it lessens the load, though the IL specific stuff will not be of help and I really don't know what else there is, so saying this somewhat in the dark.

Rob

Robert Carey | Partner
Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP
Phoenix, AZ 85253
(602) 840-5900
rob@hbsslaw.com

7. It is my understanding that in the *McFadden* case, the Fenix Defendants voluntarily agreed to allow the plaintiffs limited discovery, and that the information requested in discovery went beyond information for the state of Illinois.

8. On November 19, 2024, Defense Counsel responded by email that “[h]aving carefully considered your request and having discussed it with our client, unfortunately, we cannot agree to your request for ‘limited discovery’ at this stage, nor to a modification of the briefing schedule.” For the Court’s convenience, the entirety of that email is reproduced verbatim below:

1 From: Russell, Jason D <Jason.Russell@skadden.com>
2 Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2024 at 7:56 AM
3 To: 'Robert Carey' <rob@hbsslaw.com>
4 Subject: RE: Fenix CD Cal

5 Rob,

6 Thank you for your email. Because we only received the
7 proposed discovery Friday night, I was not able to discuss it
8 with my client until yesterday. Having carefully considered
9 your request and having discussed it with our client,
10 unfortunately, we cannot agree to your request for “limited
11 discovery” at this stage, nor to a modification of the briefing
12 schedule. As set out below, we believe your requests
13 misunderstand the relevant points of the motion to dismiss for
14 forum non conveniens pending before the Court. So that our
15 position is clear, let me set out a few points.

16 First, any discovery targeted at the “private interest factors” is
17 irrelevant to the analysis the Court will have to conduct. This is
18 not a motion to dismiss for forum non conveniens without a
19 contract. Your clients agreed to a forum selection clause. As our
20 motion explained, the existence of a forum selection clause
21 means the private interest factors are already decided as a
22 matter of law in favor of the Fenix Defendants. There are no
23 grounds for a fact-finding expedition into these factors.

24 Second, your proposed discovery topics all relate to either
25 private interest factors or to a personal jurisdiction analysis,
26 none of which are relevant here. The Fenix Defendants’
27 interactions with and/or presence in California might, at best, be
28 relevant to a personal jurisdiction analysis, but that motion has
been withdrawn. That information might also, at best, be
relevant to the availability of compulsory process based on
jurisdiction, but that is a private interest factor and therefore
irrelevant. The location of evidence is likewise a private interest
factor, and Fenix Internet’s activities in OnlyFans’ US activities
is only conceivably relevant to personal jurisdiction, and not
forum non conveniens.

29 Your other proposed discovery topics are similarly focused on
30 private interest factors. The burden on the Fenix Defendants of
31 litigating in California is a private interest factor, which is
32 already decided in the Fenix Defendants’ favor. Prior versions
33 of the forum selection clause were already provided in the
34 Taylor Declaration, do not require discovery, and the
35 declaration covers the relevant time period. In any event, the
36 information sought is publicly available via the Internet. The
37 Fenix Defendants’ relationships with other California-based
38 entities remains, again, only conceivably relevant to the

1 personal jurisdiction analysis at best, which is separate from
2 forum non conveniens. And while not relevant, some of that
3 information has also already been provided by Agency
Defendants themselves.

4 Third, I am sure you are not seeking information related to
5 attorney-client privilege. Nevertheless, your discovery topic
6 4.b. regarding Fenix Defendants' relationships with counsel in
7 California conceivably can be construed as seeking information
8 covered by attorney-client privilege. In addition to being
irrelevant for the reasons described above, the Fenix
Defendants will not provide information that seeks to invade
the privilege nor will the Fenix Defendants waive that privilege.

9 Fourth, there is no "overlap" of jurisdictional discovery with
10 FNC-related discovery, because our Rule 12 motion has been
11 withdrawn and is not pending. If our FNC motion is granted,
there will never be even a theoretical argument for
jurisdictional discovery.

12 Fifth, the Fenix Defendants will not consent to
13 releasing McFadden discovery in this case. At the outset, as we
14 discussed in general terms before I saw your specific requests,
15 the discovery in McFadden is relevant (if at all) only to
16 personal jurisdiction, which is not relevant here with no
17 personal jurisdiction motion pending, and is subject to a
protective order in that suit. In addition, as you noted, that
discovery concerned issues unique to Illinois law and has little
to no relevance in this case under California or Ninth Circuit
law.

18 We do not believe that you need, or are entitled to conduct,
19 discovery to oppose our FNC motion. You have had our motion
20 to dismiss for forum non conveniens since October, stipulated
21 to the current briefing schedule both before you had the motion
and once again after it was filed, and did not raise discovery as
an issue during either of those negotiations on the briefing
schedule.

22 I appreciate you reaching out with your request and look
23 forward to amicably working through issues going forward.

24 Best,

25 Jason

26
27 9. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
28

Executed this 21st day of November, 2024, in Phoenix, Arizona.

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By /s/ Robert B. Carey

Robert B. Carey